

RE-REFERENDUM LOGIC

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

According to the 'B.B.C. *Today* programme on 5th February last, the Consumers' Association conducted a poll on continued British membership of the European Economic Community. The result, published in *Which?* magazine, showed a majority of 58 per cent in favour of withdrawal. Mrs. Thatcher's response to this was a prompt declaration that she believed a referendum would show a majority in favour of *remaining* in the Common Market. Asked in an interview on Dutch T.V. about polls showing that most Britons were opposed to E.E.C. membership, she said she "would not put too much reliance" on them.

So! Referendum rears its ugly head again. Whenever doubts about our connection with the so-called Common Market are allowed to seep through the media like blood showing on the bandages covering a mortal wound, the suggested treatment for the dying patient is always the same: do not operate to remove the bullet, 'ask the people' first.

Defeating Experiences

After the past defeating experiences in this field, it might be supposed that more warning of the lethal dangers of engaging in any such activity would be totally redundant. Yet, when we look at the attitudes of the 'anti-Market' M.P.s' it is plain that it would not be at all naive to suppose that if and when they do anything other than periodically debate the subject, the only action called for will be a fresh referendum. The most ominous portent in this connection is the remark of a chairman of amalgamated anti-Common Market groups that "we have learned our lessons" in the conduct of these exercises in democracy, which was not followed by an announcement of absolute abstention in the future.

If we do not unequivocally denounce the very idea of a referendum on such a subject, we shall fall into exactly the same trap as before. In the circumstances, we make no apology for repeating what *Candour* said back in 1974:

"We have fought too long in the war against the power of International Finance acting through successive suborned British governments to be

deceived by one of them now. *Candour* has for twenty years and more been the first journal to expose and denounce the treason enacted by each and all administrations responsible for every erosion of British sovereignty from the destruction of our Empire to the absorption of our homelands into the European political, economic and ethnic stew. Our continued existence in spite of wounds, losses and the worst the enemy can do in the way of smears, sneers and jeers has earned for us the right to ask a heedful hearing.

"So we have 'the chosen ground'. Referendum is being advocated by anti-Marketters as our last defence against British participation in the E.E.C., but when it is called, it will be by one, other or all of the parties already committed to the E.E.C. *in principle*. "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." The enemy has chosen the ground.

"Obviously, the voters will expect the government of the day to abide by the result. Thus, in the event of a pro-European majority, millions of loyal subjects will be turned into traitors overnight having agreed in advance to co-operate in the enactment of treason should that be the 'will of the people'. The last ditch will be overrun.

"On the other hand, should the majority be 'anti', what more probable than that the victors will retire with their laurels, and their armies disperse leaving the very same betrayers occupying the vacated lines in readiness to hand over to the 'irresistible force' that will timely loom on the right of left flank?

Lessons of History

"Two pieces of history should help us to predict the outcome.

"At the end of the Second World War the British peoples were undoubtedly under the impression that they had won it. They did not look for spoils, for they thought they had fought for and won the right to enjoy the fruits that they had cultivated in their own backyards. But these had been signed away by their own political leaders on promissory notes at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods even while troops were still engaged in battle.

"In the 'fifties when the Belgian Government held a referendum to decide whether their King Leopold should remain the monarch of the Belgians, the majority of votes were cast in favour of Leopold. Then, Henri Spaak — already a notorious internationalist, led a march on Brussels and threatened bloody revolution if the King stayed. King Leopold went and the Belgians lost both empire and sovereignty. So much for 'the will' of the people.

Single Question

"We do not need an official referendum to oppose treason. Indeed, we cannot *have* a referendum to decide whether we will be traitors or not. The only question we should ask is: **WHEN ?**

"*When* are we going to refuse to co-operate in our own demise ?

"*When* are we, as a nation, going to take back our own ?

"*When* shall we denounce and defeat treason in all its forms ?

"*When* shall we demand that British governments shall be British and serve only British interests ?

"The answer for *Candour* is: **NOW !** Everyone at every time in every place. If nothing else, get yourself a Union Jack, sew the injunction 'E.E.C. OUT' in the middle of it and produce it on all occasions when and where it will gain the most publicity. If you do not know how to get on live television, ask your children — they know. Do it in political season and out.

"If we want to win — that will be referendum enough."

Mr. Goldman Opines

The comment from the Consumers' Association director, Mr. Peter Goldman (!), that followed the *Today* programme's news of the anti-Market majority in their poll was: "The ignorance concerning the Common Market among the public is abysmal." However, the only example of this "ignorance" which Mr. Goldman could bring himself to quote was that many of those interviewed thought that Britain spends more on the E.E.C. than on social security ! Exclamation marks of shock and horror could almost be heard over the air. "Of course," we were told, "Britain spends three times more on social security than on the Common Market." Did we hear someone say, "So there!"?

There are only two things the British people need to know about the so-called Common Market:

First, membership necessitates surrender of national sovereignty and is thus high treason. So we need not waste any time discussing the destination of

mountains of butter or meat, the red herrings of the rights of fishermen or the price or value of anything. Even if there were any economic advantages to be derived from being in the E.E.C., treason is too high a price to pay.

Second, there is the phoney nature of red, pink or pale blue opposition. Once it is understood that the hierarchies of Lib-Lab-Con and sundry amalgamations are composed of committed internationalists who *of their nature* welcome anything that appears to promote the establishment of a cosmopolitan ethnic stew, we are fools if we think a Socialist abandonment of the E.E.C. would lead anywhere but to another even darker door to British obliteration.

Vote OUT!

The only vote we want is the Vote OUT and as the initial treason was committed in the House of Commons, that is where it must be repudiated. To achieve that aim should be the object of every true Briton (English, Scots, Welsh and Irish, no matter what any Nationality Bill may say). It is still true that attack is the best method of defence. So do not wait for the enemy to do it first. What we want is *action* with audacity, audacity, *always*, audacity.

BUY AND DISTRIBUTE

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

By A. K. CHESTERTON

A booklet containing articles written for *Candour* in 1971 on the threat posed to the integrity and unity of this country by membership of the European Common Market.

Exposed are the lies of politicians like Edward Heath who engineered our submission to the E.E.C.

Single copies: 50p.

5 for £2. 10 for £3.50.

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST,
HAMPSHIRE GU33 7DD.

PLUNDERING THE WHITE WORLD

by ROBERT BLAKE

I recall reading an article some years ago by John Rowan Wilson which mentioned the Flagellants. They were a fourteenth century cult who, at the time of the Black Death, traipsed about the countryside inflicting corporal punishment on themselves and anybody else foolish enough to co-operate. This flagellation was intended as a form of atonement for some vague, unspecified misdeeds committed by European civilisations. What, in fact, ailed them was a collective mental aberration whereby they were obsessed with imaginary sins. Wilson called them "moral hypocondriacs".

A similar form of mass hysteria has today gripped hold of many in the West who consider themselves intellectuals, as seen by the continual moaning and breast-beating about the 'sickness' of Western civilisation. Take, for instance, a publication entitled *North-South: A Programme For Survival* (published by Pan Books), which is more commonly known as the Brandt Report. Since it appeared last year, politicians and media have not stopped sounding off about it.

Trilateral Origins

Its theme is familiar, for it echoes calls first made in 1975 by the Rockefeller-controlled Trilateral Commission for an "new international economic order". The world, we are told, is in an unprecedented mess which is all the fault of the greedy White nations. The only hope is for a "restructuring of the world system" by which the North (the "developed" world to which we belong) would transfer a large share of resources to the South (the "underdeveloped" or "developing" world). It is *not* intended to transfer resources from the Sudan, say, to South Africa! By this mechanism, there will be achieved in years to come a kind of global egalitarian state which, in effect, will progressively reduce our standard of living to that of the filthiest slums of Kingston or Calcutta.

The members of Willy Brandt's commission who produced the report were drawn from rich and poor nations and from 'across the political spectrum'. Presumably the obese figure of Edward Heath was intended to represent the British Right! Actually, judging by the report's message, all the commissioners were united in holding views which transcend national and party labels by means of a common preference for all that is big, vague and internationalist. In short, they were One-Worlders.

Their utterance of guilt-ridden humbug about economic exploitation by the developed nations of the world was matched by an hysterical linking of essentially unrelated facts. I recall seeing these taken up and emblazoned across the masochistic editorial page of *The Observer* one Sunday. For example, we were told that for one jet fighter, 40,000 village pharmacies could be provided in the poor parts of the world. Although Herr Brandt does not appear to have noticed it, the threat to world peace is so great today that we positively *need* jet fighters guarding our shores rather than financing umpteen contraception and abortion clinics. Perhaps this "ex"-Communist still clings to his declared view that Mr. Brezhnev is a man of peace, primarily concerned with raising the living standards of his subjects!

Guaranteed To Fail

However wonderful the public relations image created for the Brandt Report, the fact is it will *not* succeed in making poor people in Africa and Asia one penny richer. As has been frequently observed by Professor Peter Bauer, wealth extracted from Northern taxpayers (rich and poor alike) inevitably ends up not in the hands of the Southern poor but with their evil, ignorant, negligent or corrupt governments. There was a lesson for Herr Brandt and his friends in a *Daily Telegraph* report recently on Italy, where the North-South programme might be described as already operating on a microcosmic scale.

Out of a mixture of highmindedness and politics, the Italian governments, through the agency of the Casa Del Mezzogiorno, have been sending investment from the north to the south in huge quantities . . . and the population of the southern regions has been moving north in numbers even more impressive! In southern provinces, there has been created what is called the New Mafia, the rippers-off quite specifically of aid contracts and tenders. As the *Telegraph's* editor put it, all the forced investment and Government-allocated millions have "failed to make of the Calabrian anything but a Milanese immigrant".

The experience of Italy is a pointer to what a vaster and more over-reaching scheme, such as advocated by the Brandt Report, will mean in terms of a 'rising tide of colour' threatening to engulf and change the entire character of the White world. This is a battle which flagellant internationalists must not be allowed to win.

WHO WAS THE DRAGON?

by ANTHONY COONEY

St. George, as everybody seems to forget, is Patron St. of England, and his day, *England's day*, is April 23rd. There isn't an Irishman or a Welshman in the world who does not know the date of St. Patrick's Day or St. David's Day, but come the morning of April 23rd the average Englishman will be startled to see the occasional rose in the button-hole worn by a patriotic neighbour, most likely a member of the Royal Society of St. George.

Why is this? For most of us St. George is a half-legendary figure who slew a fairy tale dragon. Nothing could be further from the truth. St. George was a real person who lived at the time when Diocletian unleashed the last of the great persecutions of Christianity. He seems to have been a high-ranking member of the Army and was probably a favourite of Diocletian. St. Ambrose tells us that when the persecution broke out the majority of Christians were anxious to conceal their religion. Not so George. He went before the Emperor and pleaded for tolerance, declaring: "I am a Christian, and confess that Christ is both Lord and God." Galerius, Diocletian's evil genius, was furious. George was arrested, offered honours and wealth if he would offer a pinch of incense to the "Divine Emperor" and when he refused, was first tortured and then beheaded on Good Friday, April 23rd, 304 A.D., a day which ever since has been held as his Feast Day.

George's example gave his fellow Christians some backbone. Increasing numbers refused to offer sacrifice to the tyrant Emperor. Within a few years Diocletian was dead; Galerius had become Emperor but was slain at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge, and Constantine had revoked the Edicts against the Christians.

A strong tradition has it that George and Constantine were youthful comrades-in-arms at the Court of Constantine's father in York. Whatever the truth of this is, it is certain that Constantine played a big part in promoting the popularity of St. George. He built a great church over the place where George was beheaded, which stands to this day. Over his grave in Lydda, Palestine, where George's friends had buried him and planted a rose bush, Constantine built a second church.

Constantine also minted a coin showing a dragon lying prone beneath the initials of the name of Christ, and this brings us to the idea of St. George slaying the dragon. The personal standard of the

Roman Emperors was a purple dragon. The last Roman Emperor to be proclaimed in Britain was Maxim Welteg, whose legions proclaimed him Emperor at Caernarvon. He never actually reached Rome, being killed in battle in Gaul, but his sons back in Britain took his title and the dragon standard — hence the Dragon Banners of Wales and Wessex.

The interesting question is: was the "Dragon" slain by St. George the Roman Emperor Galerius? St. George, of course, did not actually kill Galerius, but by withstanding his tyranny he paved the way for the popular support which Constantine won when he rebelled against Galerius. St. George, the legend seems to say, overcame the Dragon Standard and brought it into the service of Christianity.

So on St. George's Day it is well for Englishmen to remember that their Patron Saint is as real and historical as anyone else's, and, if the story is understood right, so was the dragon.

* * * *

ROBERT BLAKE WRITES — It is a sad fact, as Anthony Cooney points out, that every year on April 23rd St. George's name means little to the vast majority of the population who ignore his anniversary. But it is a date which we should *all* strive to accept a personal responsibility to commemorate, whether by wearing a rose, flying the flag, organising a party or dinner, or simply praying for England.

It is worth recalling that some authorities like Professor L. A. Waddell (in *The Makers of Civilisation*) have traced back the story of St. George of Merrie England thousands of years before the life of the Christian Saint of Cappadocia to the first great Sumerian King Gaur (or Gaor), whose reign circa 3378 B.C. saw the introduction of settled agriculture and the spread of art and science. He also conquered the serpent totem-worshipping aborigines of Mesopotamia and substituted monotheism for their blood sacrifices. In mark of this achievement, he was represented in the literature, art and mythology of the Sumerians, Babylonians and Hittites as slaying a destructive and menacing dragon.

St. George's Day, therefore, may be said to commemorate the life of a great founder of civilisation as well as a Christian Saint who suffered martyrdom in perpetuating civilisation and the spiritual ideal. On April 23rd we should also

remember all others who in St. George's name have fought the good fight for his ideals. These include several Englishmen who had the special distinction of birth or death on April 23rd, such as Shakespeare, Turner, Wordsworth or Rupert Brooke.

It is the belief of a growing number of patriots that St. George's Day should be made a public holiday. To that end, we unreservedly support the campaign initiated by Mr. Cooney via his admirable *Liverpool Newsletter* to write to the Prime Minister, at the House of Commons, urging her to make April 23rd a public holiday for England.

FOR THE RIGHT POINT OF VIEW

READ LEAGUE REVIEW

Subscription for 10 issues: £5
9/11 Kensington High Street,
London W8 5NP.

Very valuable for students of languages. French, German, Italian, Spanish, Russian grammars. Composition with keys. Vocabularies. Antiquarian. Details from Albert Elder, Flat 1, Gannet House, 6 Hartington Place, Eastbourne, Sussex.

LIMEHOUSE BLUES

Eeny, meeny, miney mo
Jenkins, Shirley, Dr. No
Owen's flat down Limehouse way
They meet — the rebels, who must stay.

Conotation of Chinese
This Socialistic Gang-of-Three
Appreciating not the joke
For leadership so less bespoke.

Dr. No — once Dr. Yes
For Rhodesia's bloody mess
"One-man-one-vote" did advocate
And now, surprise, 'tis his own fate.

Brother Jenkins on French leave
Euro-riches up his sleeve,
Now would chair his off-shore-isle
To ensure no codicil.

And the lady, what of she?
Who floundered in locality,
Anxious any tub to thump,
Any gimmick, any rump.

Three Right Honourables to boot
To the mainland, there to suit
The "heads-no-win" style, "tails-to-lose"
For nationals a Limehouse Blues.

B. E. BIGGS.

On behalf of the A. K. Chesterton Trust, we extend our sincere thanks to the anonymous patriot who has sent a number of £5 postal orders to us over the past few months — R.deB.

ANOTHER FIRST-DITCH STAND

The failure of Dr. Andries Treurnicht (leader of the conservative faction in the South African Nationalist Party) to match other Nationalist leaders in making a public utterance on the country's Day of the Covenant remembrance celebrations has prompted our colleague Ivor Benson to suggest in his **Behind The News** bulletin that it is all part of a carefully worked-out strategy which has the support and approval of his supporters. Dr. Treurnicht, he maintains, has been "taking great care not to put a foot wrong as a loyal and disciplined member of the National Party." How else could one explain the silence of a man who is "the personification of the values which the Voortrekkers at Blood River promised in their 'Covenant of God' to protect and uphold"?

Mr. Benson seems to suggest that any regeneration of resistance in South Africa must come from **within** the Nationalist Party and that the movement's leader is keeping quiet temporarily about his views so that the press cannot down him in advance.

In advance of what, we ask ourselves? Does the 'Right' learn **nothing** from the Suez rebels, the fifty Salisbury-inspired Lords who were going to save the Central African Federation, the Monday Club, the Anglo-Rhodesian Society, the 'Rightists' in Ian Smith's Rhodesian Front, the subtle Lord Graham, SASCON (whose initials are all we can remember of them), and Angus Maude, Tufton Beamish, Legge-Bourke, Uncle Lord Boothby and all? We will believe in these dedicated, secret Right-wingers when they actually **do** something other than die in the first ditch — which they usually dig for themselves, anyway!

CHRISTIANITY AND MR. COHEN

by A. K. CHESTERTON

If I believed there to be any religious quarrel between the native and acquired populations of Britain (which I do not), and if the *New Statesman* were to accept such an advertisement (which it would not), then one might look in its columns for something along these lines:—

“Judaism — What Is It? By A. K. Chesterton. For better understanding the faith claiming to dominate post-war education and reconstruction. 2/2 post paid.”

What an outcry would resound throughout the land! I should be blackguarded as a religious persecutor and there would be a rush of advertisers like the “Prudential” and the “Alliance” to withdraw the support they accord the *New Statesman* in its fight to bring their existence to an end.

And the outcry would be perfectly proper.

Actual Advertisement

Since I do not propose to write anything of the kind, the hypothesis is valuable only because I now set down beneath it the text of an advertisement which really has appeared in that earnest journal. Here it is:—

“Christianity — What Is It? By Chapman Cohen. For better understanding the faith claiming to dominate post-war education and reconstruction. 2/2 post paid.”

In this context, however, there is no outcry; no rush to withdraw advertisements. The *New Statesman*, which would rightly shrink in horror from the thought of publicising an attack on Judaism, prints the announcement of Mr. Cohen's attack on Christianity without a moment's hesitation. The first it would look upon as indefensible; the second it does as a matter of course. Why? Because there are no Christian advertisers to withdraw?

Now I do not think it necessary to regard the phenomenon known as Mr. Chapman Cohen with undue seriousness; in all likelihood he is a harmless rationalist unable to hear much because of the buzzing of the free-thinking bees in his bonnet. But nevertheless I would suggest two things for his consideration. First, that Christianity has been in these islands a sufficiently long time for Christians to have some “claim” (his own deliciously scornful word) in the matter of the nation's future. One would not like even to guess where Mr. Cohen's family were living when St. Augustine came to Britain.

The second suggestion is this: since Mr. Cohen finds himself among a friendly, tolerant people who would deplore an attack upon the religion of his co-racials, might it not be an act of grace for him not to take advantage of their tolerance and in his turn to refrain from attacks upon a religion which is no way concerns him or his race?

Common Attitude

My suggestions do not apply merely to Mr. Cohen and religion. The same kind of attitude is to be found in the spheres of politics and commerce. Thus there are scores of cases wherein Mr. Cohen's kinsmen have found asylum here after persecution abroad, a fact which nevertheless has not prevented them, after mastering the barest rudiments of our language, from standing upon soap-boxes and inveighing against British institutions, not excepting even our Royal Family.

They are free to do so, it seems, but would it not be a magnificent gesture, a truly noble act of decorum, if they were voluntarily to relinquish this freedom, as an expression of their gratitude?

Similarly, in the commercial world, would they not do themselves honour if they were to accept the British commercial code so long as they sought to live and work among British people?

I do not put forward these suggestions solely on account of the people “claiming” to be native here. Anti-Semitism is not a pretty thing. If the renunciations I have mentioned were to be made, it is more than likely that there would soon be no anti-semitism, and that, surely, would be a clear gain for all concerned.

All that is wanted is a little tact, a little modesty, some sense of what is due from guest to host. If the majority allow a minority complete freedom, has that minority no obligation to look to its manners in return?

THE MYSTERY OF ENOCH

by P.W.

Mr. Enoch Powell is, in many ways, the mystery figure of British politics. A brilliant, persuasive speaker who, amazingly, tells the truth about the coloured immigration threat and who, for his pains, has had to withdraw from Britain to Northern Ireland, he looks at first sight to be an unequivocal case of the misunderstood prophet, chased into the desert but still thundering forth his denunciations from there. Many still hold him to be the one future hope for the salvation of Britain.

But he bears an obvious parallel to his namesake: the enigmatic Biblical Book of Enoch. It has never been quite settled whether or not this book should really form part of the Canon of Scripture. Though quoted in the Bible as we have it, in the Epistle of Jude, it was apparently suppressed and then lost for centuries till a copy was discovered in Ethiopia in the eighteenth century by the explorer Bruce. Even then, however, its authenticity was doubted, though other copies which subsequently turned up tended to prove its genuineness. Today, though it is recognised as an apocalyptic writing of great power and persuasiveness, it still remains outside the Canon. Students are advised to treat it with caution and believers in general are not encouraged to read it. It is exactly so with Mr. Powell. Is he a Conservative? Conservative followers in general are encouraged to have their doubts and treat him with great caution. And there is an identical uncertainty about whether or not he belongs to, or should be admitted to, the true canon of the Nationalist camp.

This latter question has become more pressing in the last few years, with definite signs of a move towards the Right in politics away from the chaos that Liberalism and the Left have brought. Voices have been raised asking Mr. Powell to make his position clear. The *Daily Mirror*, in particular, asked him five years ago to make a public announcement that he would never place himself at the head of the National Front. (It seemed to assume that such an announcement by itself would be enough to ensure that no votes were ever cast for that party again, which would probably withdraw from disappointment. It is well to remember, therefore, that the Bible got on very well without the Book of Enoch, though deprived of it for fifteen centuries or more.) It is time that a true Nationalist assessment of Mr. Powell should be made, and that he should be looked at fairly and squarely. Just what sort of a book is he? Can we read him rightly?

"Respectable" Opposition

Mr. Powell's reputation rests on the image he carries of being Britain's chief opponent of coloured immigration. Here is a wonder indeed — a conservative Conservative! But there are doubts, and A. K. Chesterton voiced some of them in an article in *Candour* some years ago. In the first place, is Mr. Powell a supporter of *anti*-immigration? This may seem a strange or even meaningless question, but those who have followed the strange history of so-called opposition to Communism will know that it is not. It is possible to follow a policy or belong to a party whose stated aims are to counter communism, and yet to be virulently anti *anti*-communist. And to some extent this does seem to be Mr. Powell's position, relative to immigration. Though not exactly respectable (for all opposition to coloured immigration is *per se* so frightfully *unrespectable*), he nevertheless represents a sort of respectable type of opposition to it. After all, he *was* a member of the Conservative Party!

Furthermore, he is not talking about immigration all the time. He does not stump the country making speeches about it, rallying and organising support. All he does is make some notable speeches which are widely reported (a significant fact, since no-one else's speeches against it are reported at all), and he asks questions in the House of Commons; and, of course, he withdraws to Ulster. Though denounced in the nationwide press as intolerable, this is in fact just tolerable. If you want to oppose coloured immigration, Enoch Powell is your good example. Particularly note his Conservative Party membership first of all and now his Ulster Unionist label (in essence, still Conservative). To the discerning eye, these are unfailing guarantees that whatever the appearances may be, underneath it all he is very solid.

You see, to be a Conservative today means that you are not too far to the Right. The Right-wing has been firmly blue-labelled 'Poison'. It is 'dangerous'. It is 'extremist'. So at least if you are anti-immigration with Conservative Mr. Powell, you are none of these things. You won't actually *do* anything about it. You will sit still and be conservative. But it goes further than that. As A. K. Chesterton pointed out in his *Candour* article, Enoch Powell once attended meetings of the Bilderberg group, which is one of the chief — if not *the* chief — co-ordinating instruments of that World Cryptocracy

or Secret Government of the Elite which the *true* Right-wing is dedicated to expose and combat.

Powell's Dining Club

Perhaps it would not be an irrelevant digression to delineate this dining club of Mr. Powell's a little more fully at this point. The Bilderberg Group's chief function is to brief the political and economic leaders of all the Western nations (together with their counterparts in 'shadow cabinets' who may reasonably be expected to assume power via the electoral merry-go-round in the not-too-distant future), and also the leading figures in the industrial and commercial world, on the economic and financial policies which have been approved for international implementation at the secret 'top level'. These are policies which individual governments are expected to translate into effective actuality either immediately, over the next decade or so, or further into the future. For example, the European Common Market was dreamed up long ago by those who now organise the Bilderberg Group and stand behind it.

It is, in fact, an organising directorate for the E.E.C., though one which can never be held accountable, since it has never been officially set up and appointed, either by the E.E.C. or by anyone else who might demand an account. In effect, its meetings are as good as secret, for they are universally 'unknown' to the press at large, being never reported, by tacit agreement, order and consent, while the matters discussed and promulgated are reserved for the eyes and ears only of those invited, who may not divulge them to 'outsiders' — i.e. to the public who will be affected by them. Elaborate security precautions are taken to ensure that there will be no leaks, with entire hotels being taken over weeks beforehand, searched minutely from foundations to roof for electronic 'bugs', and then run for the duration of the session by an entirely new security-screened and handpicked staff. Yet Mr. Powell, who attended Bilderberg meetings, is also the well-known 'official' opponent of the Common Market in this country!

Principle Of Fluctuation

Every student of the Right should constantly remember one fact which can hardly be stressed enough: that the World Power Conspiracy we are seeking to understand and expose and ultimately defeat is the brainchild of men who developed their initial expertise through becoming adepts in national and international financial manipulation. The first thing they learnt was the principle of fluctuation — rise and fall, boom and slump, confidence and panic,

inflation and depression. Everyone else is still subject to this fluctuation; they have mastered it and made it subject to themselves. Thus, in the economic and financial field rises and falls are no longer natural or spontaneous. They come about because they have been planned that way, and each one serves a definite purpose.

In the main, the depressions are for forcing those businesses and nations hit by them to take the next step into the socialist fold. The boom periods (which are never very long, for it is not planned that anyone shall get really rich, and if you look closely at them you will see they are really only periods when credit is easy — i.e. when you are allowed to get into debt) are calculated so that strangulation does not proceed too quickly and get recognised for what it is. Those who benefit by them get a breather and are encouraged to think that everything is going to be all right now. While licking their own wounds and trying to recover, they will also take no action while they watch others elsewhere going through what they have just been through, and perhaps going under altogether. Booms prevent people getting desperate and trying to tamper in fundamental ways with the financial system itself, even if they do not understand it.

But fluctuations also occur in other fields besides the economic one, and over some of these the manipulators' control is at present less perfect. The most important of all is the periodic swing from Right to Left in public political opinion, the *emotion* of conservatism alternating with the *emotion* of liberalism. This field has now become of paramount concern to the monopolists as they plan their final advance from limited economic control to the ultimate goal of outright political control.

Needless to say, this particular swing has been observed and studied by them with meticulous care. It is a swing which is obvious to everyone, of course, and every politician wishes he had the secret of how to swing it the way he wants it. Every public statement he makes is directed towards that end. But as in the economic field, those with 'savvy' know that *the real secret is to be able to win no matter which way the pendulum swings*. In other words, your men must be in both political parties (or in all three, or four, or five, if there are several). This is the explanation of the phenomenon we now witness in the British political arena where we no longer have three completely distinct political parties — Conservative, Liberal and Labour — with recognisably different alternative policies, but three *liberal* parties, all professing to contend but all offering the

same wares. The public gets a change of names, but always the same policy.

But although this is a very substantial and effective step towards control of fluctuation in the political field, it is not yet quite complete control. As President Lincoln is reported to have said: "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all the people all of the time." After a while it can happen that a voting public will get sick of 'changes of government' which prove to be no change at all. A deep-seated yearning for a real spring-clean can set in. A grass-roots movement dedicated to remove the whole entrenched system which has run the show and ruled the roost in its liberal Left-wing enslaving way for half-a-century or more might appear and achieve real strength. What is to be done then?

Waiting In The Wings

The answer is to have a man waiting in the wings who looks just like the figure of destiny called into being by history to lead this reaction. The movement must be allowed to gather steam and momentum. It must become quite explicit, focussed upon certain definite real issues or grievances. The right man, chosen for the job, must come to personify it in this sense. Public feeling is always to some extent inarticulate, but he will articulate it. It will come to appear self-evident that a vote for him is a vote for that which the public has at last realised it really wants. He may emerge, like Winston Churchill or Charles de Gaulle, as a national hero. Yet all the time he will be your man. And then as long as he leads it, the whole process can always be directed and kept under control by you, as long as you are subtle enough to keep quite out of sight yet always have an unshakable hold on him. Could Enoch Powell be such a man?

The point is that the World Power Conspiracy, drawing upon its aeon of business experience, is quite subtle enough. Let us cite a concrete example from the not-too-distant past. It may be remembered that in the United States Presidential election of November 1964, a certain Senator Barry Goldwater contended and won the nomination as Republican Party candidate. In doing so, he canalised a hard-core swing to conservatism which had suddenly become a real force on the American political scene, the final outcome of which no-one could quite foresee at the time. His nomination was hailed as a real victory for the Right by the press throughout the Western world, for the most part in accents of alarm. A searchlight of attention was focussed on him and just when it was bright enough he proceeded

to tread heavily on every emotionally sensitive alarm bell.

The statement that really 'did' it — which failed to take note of the tactical moment at which it was uttered — was in his policy speech just after his nomination when he declared that 'extremism' in support of what was right was right and proper. Hitherto uncommitted voters were shocked straight into the Johnson camp because the news media had been shrieking for weeks that trigger-happy 'extremists' anxious to risk a nuclear war with Russia were aiming at seizing power. Goldwater's statement appeared to be confirmation from his own mouth that they were right. There was no possibility after that of a real appraisal of what the Right was really aiming at offering.

What followed was a landslide victory for Johnson (though 40 million Americans still voted conservative). Barry Goldwater then went right out of politics. His name and his defeat and the word 'extremism' still linger in the public mind, however, and all three together are now indelibly associated with American hardcore conservatism. It has become as impossible to separate them as it is to prevent the accusation of an admiration for 'Nazi brutality' being levelled at anyone who today shows an interest in and concern for the survival of higher radical types. It was a brilliant piece of work from the conspirators' point of view.

Need For Caution

Is Enoch Powell a figure of the Goldwater type? It is the contention of this writer that he very well could be. There are many signs indicative of it. The curious ambiguities in his own personal political record, combine with his refusal ever to join or identify with any unequivocally Right-wing party in this country, should be enough to make every real Rightist cautious in appraising him. And the enormous publicity he can command at a moment's notice in press and radio on every one of the not-so-frequent occasions he chooses to say something which the real Right-wing is saying every day, is an even more sinister identifying mark.

Probably he never would try to place himself at the head of the National Front. If that party ever does begin to shake the establishment by starting to win elections, however, we may well witness an enormously publicised resurgence of Mr. Powell, returning to and leading the Conservative Party as 'the man of the hour' and 'the saviour of Britain'. Anti-immigration and anti-Common Market will no longer be 'non-U' — they will both very much be 'in'. But the effects of such a move in terms of

benefit to the Right-wing cause and to Britain will, to everyone's astonishment, turn out to be nil.

Perhaps Mr. Powell will yet commit himself unequivocally to the Right-wing and prove me wrong by sharing its uphill road to eventual genuine victory. Till he does, don't believe all you see and hear. Watch him carefully. "Prove all things; hold fast only to that which is Right."

Editor's comment — While thoroughly agreeing with P.W.'s trenchant analysis of how the 'party game' is manipulated in the interests of its masters, we are inclined now to doubt that Enoch Powell might be wheeled into the political limelight at some future point in an active capacity as Britain's saviour.

His usefulness to the Establishment seems likely to be limited to a continuing polemical role, ensuring by means of his occasional excellent speeches on coloured immigration and E.E.C. membership that the dynamism which could bring about change is allowed to escape into the air as countless thousands of potential patriotic fighters remain seated in their drawing-rooms and murmur their assent to the notion of leaving the struggle for national resurgence in his "capable" hands. As a consequence, not one single unwanted immigrant will be returned from whence he came and not one single link will be cut in the internationalist chain of command between Brussels and London. In the meantime, let us resolve to press forward in battle without Powell.

THE NUCLEAR AGE

There exists throughout the Western world an increasingly vociferous leftist anti-nuclear lobby which appears to dominate most of the press and electronic media with its propaganda line. However, a new book by Dr. Petr Beckmann, Professor of Engineering at the University of Colorado, makes a valuable contribution to the case of those fighting this lobby. For Beckmann has written a witty, highly informative, thoroughly documented, caustic polemic that demolishes the myths, distortions and outright falsehoods of the anti-nuclear crowd — the people whom the author calls the "superstition-mongers".

To those critics of nuclear power who say it is not safe, Dr. Beckmann replies: "This book never tries to make the point that nuclear power is safe; the point it makes is that it is far safer than any other form of large-scale energy conversion yet invented. To ask for absolutely safe energy is much the same thing as asking for incombustible fuel." What, however, of the common fear that one of those nuclear reactors might go haywire and produce an atomic explosion? Beckmann explains, always in layman's language, that such an explosion is physically impossible. He adds that above all, the media keep playing on the psychological association of 'nuclear' and 'bomb', which makes as much sense as the association of 'electronic' and 'chair'.

Beckmann also compares the dangers of nuclear power with those of fossil-fired power. There are many aspects: coal versus uranium mining, the transport of the fuel, the dangers of storage (of liquified natural gas, for instance, in densely populated areas), pollution, terrorism, sabotage and waste disposal. To extract some uranium from the ground and then rebury it sealed in glass in the most stable geological formations does not worsen the sum total of any possible menace. But when the 320 pounds of coal waste per person gets into the air or into ash piles, there are dangers. As the author states: 'gaseous poison doesn't threaten to kill people: it kills them very definitely.' So the 'dangers' of nuclear power, in Beckmann's view, are little more than a series of improbable, hypothetical situations which have never yet occurred.

Of all the Western nations, France is setting an example in pressing ahead firmly with a nuclear energy programme — so much so that she has reduced her dependence on oil more quickly than any other industrial power. Soon, it will no longer be necessary for the French to accept the Libyan dictator Gadaffy's aggressions or insults (such as the sacking of their embassy in Tripoli) with a diplomatic turn of the cheek. Perhaps in this fact lies the secret why the anti-nuclear campaign exposed by Dr. Beckmann is so heavily backed by the Left — they object to the White man's brain rendering him independent of the Brown backsides which just happen to sit on top of so much of the world's oil!

The Health Hazards Of Not Going Nuclear by Dr. Petr Beckmann. Paperback, 190 pp. plus index. £3.50 from Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

GOD SAVE OUR GRACIOUS TONGUE

A conversation recently with a primary school teacher leads us to believe that the language vandals are on the warpath again. This time, they are proceeding by the 'thin-end-of-the-wedge' method, by means of a spelling system for backward children who, apparently, are learning spelling 'as they speak'. Without knowing the details of this scheme, it is difficult to imagine what sort of spelling will result. As English is pronounced in hundreds of different ways, it seems that it will be spelt in hundreds of different ways, too. What happens is that the poor little mites learn wrong spelling first and, when they have acquired proficiency in wrong spelling they learn correct spelling! It sounds like something out of *Alice in Wonderland*. English is one of the European languages which cannot be spelt phonetically. Any attempt at such spelling would utterly destroy the etymology of words and turn the written language into unintelligible gibberish. Take this example:

*This roil throan ov kings, this sceptud yl,
This erth of madgesti, this seet ov Mahs,
This uther Eedun, demmi-perradyz;
This fautriss bilt by Naitcher foa herself . . .*

For a translation, see King Richard II, Act II, Scene 1.

REQUIRED READING ON RACE

Eugenics and Race by Roger Pearson (36 pages).

If you accept the idea that individuals differ, then you must also understand that a race is nothing more nor less than a group of individuals who share similar characteristics, and that a race is pure or impure according to the degree of similarity of its members. Eugenics is, therefore, intimately and irrevocably linked with race; this small booklet providing a complete outline guide to both subjects.

Blood Groups and Race by Roger Pearson (44 pages with maps, charts and illustrations).

Races are now identifiable by their distinctive blood group patterns, and this book is important because it explains how the racial analysis of populations has been simplified in recent years by the development of Blood Group classification techniques.

Each booklet costs 65p., post free, from
BCM-Thule, London WC1V 6XX.

URGENTLY WANTED — L. A. Waddell's *Phoenician Origins of the Britons, Scots and Anglo-Saxons*. Please write to Robert Blake, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire.

OSTRICHISED

Ancient building, tree and bird
Legislation has protected
Bloodstock horse and cattle herd —
No doubt, too, some dog elected?
Vistas of the countryside,
Seashore, moor and mountain;
Drystone wall and rural ride,
The thatcher's roof collected.

A lovely British heritage!
But, blimey, they forgot
The ethnic homo sapiens
In this conservation lot.

Take a census but don't show
The origins of birth,
'Tis better if the proles don't know
How they are run to earth.

Juxtaposed to Parliament
A garden with sandpit
For kids to play — and coy M.P.s
Like ostriches to fit.

Of Calcutta, Trinidad,
No mention must be made!
A Doomsday look — and grassroots melt,
O Island in the shade.

B. E. BIGGS.

An embankment garden follows the river from Parliament Buildings to Lambeth Bridge, at which end is (or was) a sandpit — a childhood haunt for the author. Now it suggests a habitat for the head-in-the-sand politicians at Westminster, who have decreed their total unconcern as to the volume of immigration into our land by means of their decision to exclude from the Census this year questions on race, ethnic origins, year of entry and of naturalisation for those born outside the United Kingdom — all because the racial minorities fear such questions being answered. The Thatcher Government's decision is a disgraceful and cowardly act and Patrick Jenkin, as the Cabinet Minister ultimately responsible, should be utterly ashamed of himself.

Read

OPEN SESAME

An anthology of the poems of

B. E. BIGGS

Available now for only £1

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY
FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST,
HAMPSHIRE.

PART III

CUCKOOS IN THE LABOUR NEST

The Marx-Engels clique, founders of Bolshevism (though they never lived to see their doctrine under that name) were direct creators of Labour Socialism in Britain. Down to the early nineties trade unions were run on democratic principles, and were devoted to securing better working conditions for their members.

Socialism was unknown in trade unionism in those days. William Morris in 1883 commented on the fact that a Socialist could not get a hearing from a labour audience. As late as 1890 the Socialistic Professor W. Graham was saying, "The English working classes are not Socialists, nor are they very promising materials out of which to make Socialists."

Things were stirring at this date, however, and Engels was stirring them. In the New York Public Library is a mass of letters between Marx Engels, and a German Communist, F. A. Sorge. Sorge published some of these in 1906, but photostats of the originals made for Lieut-Col. A. H. Lane, author of "The Alien Menace", show that Sorge omitted much that was illuminating. An expert who examined the documents in full reported to Colonel Lane:

"What is particularly noticeable in the letters of Engels and Marx is the contempt of those Communists for the mentality and characters of British labour leaders and most of our so-called statesmen. Their plan for causing a bloody revolution in our islands appears to have been based on a belief that the British working men and working women were fools."

However, this bunch of revolutionaries were not polite even about one another, as may be seen from E. H. Carr's "Karl Marx". Lassalle, for instance—the hanger-on of a rich countess nineteen years older than himself—sends Marx money. Is Marx grateful? Not a bit! Marx takes the cash and carries on in letters to Engels, referring to Lassalle as "weasel-beast", the "Jewish nigger", and so on. Lassalle on holiday picks up with another woman, and is killed in a duel in consequence. Marx thereupon writes to the rich countess (with an obvious eye on the cash-box), saying he is "shocked and shattered"; Lassalle was one for whom he had "a great affection": "no one can feel deeper grief than I . . . I loved him personally," etc., etc., Then Marx sits down and writes to Engels: "The air needs purifying . . .

from this stale stink of Lassalle." Such was the pathfinder to the paradise of Socialism!

Three years after Marx's death things were moving with the Engels-Marx clique, consisting then of Engels, Eleanor Marx, Marx's youngest daughter, known as "Tussy", and her "husband", Professor Aveling (whom she never legally married). In her "Socialist Network", Mrs. Webster prints a translation of a letter from Engels to Sorge, under date of May 4, 1887:

"Aveling is making a famous agitation in the East End of London . . . he and Tussy are hard at work. It is a matter of founding an English Labour Party with an independent class programme."

Soon Engels was writing that the Gas Workers and General Labourers were being "bossed by Tussy". In 1892 Engels reported great progress in England. Says Mrs. Webster: "In January of the following year, 1893, the Independent Labour Party was founded under the leadership of Engels' tool, Keir Hardie, whom he contemptuously described as an 'over-sly Scot' . . . and 'a poor devil of a Scotch miner.'" Engels, thus poking his hand into British Labour matters, be it noted, had never even been naturalised, and lived in England under the protection of the German Government, of which there is strong suspicion he was a secret agent.

Boring From Within

From 1890, in which year it had been busy "permeating" the trades unions in Lancashire, the Fabian Society had been paying much attention to the Labour movement. It joined with the Social Democratic Federation to help float off the Independent Labour Party, and local Fabian Societies which had been formed among trade unionists turned themselves into I.L.P. branches. Unlike the Fabian Society, the I.L.P. was openly Socialist. Its methods generally, however, were underhand, as witness the following description by an old railway trades unionist who vigorously resisted the Socialist onslaught. The extract is from Mr. W. V. Osborne's "Sane Trades Unionism":

"The Independent Labour Party, more commonly known as the I.L.P. was formed in 1883 for the express purpose of permeating other organisations with Socialist doctrine. Recognising their own in-

ability to organise, they sought to use the already existing societies, and on account of this earned the name of the political cuckoos.

"Their first step was to form a Socialist group within the various Unions and branches of Unions. They kept in touch with the central body, and meeting in the secret conclave arranged their course of action. They attended regularly, and took a prominent part in the work of the branch, while the ordinary member was often apathetic and irregular in attendance. Resolutions were prepared previous to the meetings, and the supporters were always ready to play their part, so that the organised minority easily out-manoeuvred the unorganised majority.

"Branch officers who had served their societies well and faithfully for years became victims to this campaign. The edict had gone forth to capture the official positions, and this was done in the most unscrupulous manner.

"At a private meeting of the Socialist section, nominations would be decided upon for the different positions, nominators and seconders would be arranged, and often a fierce attack would be made upon the holder of the coveted position. Canvassing would go on outside the branch, quietly, and in such an indirect manner as not to expose the real purpose. The candidate would drop all talk of Socialism, and in some cases even repudiate it. The person to be driven from office, being wholly unconscious of the coming attack, would make no effort to organise support.

"For a seat on the Executive Committee, or for a delegation to an annual congress, where it was necessary for the candidate to obtain support from a number of branches, the Socialist groups in the different districts were kept in touch with each other through the central Socialist organisation. Their victory was rendered easier by limiting the number of candidates for any particular office, while the other members put forward numerous candidates, split their votes, and lost. Even after the election the plot was rarely discovered, all that was apparent being that an old officer had been replaced by a more active member.

"Once in possession of the official positions the same means was used for the manipulation of the machinery. Important matters were placed either at the top or the bottom of the agenda, so that they could be rushed through before many members had arrived or after the majority of the ordinary members had left.

"By such means the Unions were gradually drawn from the pursuit of purely industrial to political objects. No opportunity was lost to advance the Socialist propaganda. The Trade Unionist was taught

that the true function of the Unions was not collective bargaining as between employer and employed, but rather the waging of a class war in by which the employer—the supposed enemy of the worker—was to be suppressed. . .

"The fundamental principle of present day Trade Unionism appears to be class war, a war that appeals to the worst passions of human nature. It is not surprising that a movement built upon such a foundation should produce a deteriorating effect on individual character."

The Conquest of the Unions

As early as 1893 in a "Joint Manifesto of British Socialist Bodies"—comprising the I.L.P., Fabian Society, and the Social Democratic Federation — Communism was adopted as the objective.

"Our aim, one and all," said the Manifesto, "is to obtain for the whole community complete ownership and control of the means of transport, the means of manufacture, the mines and the land. Thus we look to put an end for ever to the wage system, to sweep away all distinctions of class, and eventually to establish national and international Communism on a sound basis."

The only thing left out of the full Marxian programme was the use of violence to effect the proclaimed ends. Had this been included, however, it would have been useless even to have attempted to sell Socialism to Britons. But the Socialists have never ceased to show their sympathy with those who do use force for the attainment of these ends. "That which is generally called Socialism," said Lenin in "The State and Revolution", "is termed by Marx the first or lower phrase of Communist society."

By 1899 Socialist penetration of the Trades Unions was so far advanced that at the Trades Union Congress of that year a resolution was successfully put through inviting the co-operation of "all Co-operative Societies, Socialistic, and other working-class organisations" in devising means for increased Labour representation in Parliament. This resulted in a conference in 1900 attended by delegates representing respectively 543,316 trades unionists and 22,861 Socialists. This conference set up a Labour Representation Committee with a standing executive.

The first move of the Socialists was to prevent this Labour Representation Committee from becoming a committee of the Trade Union Congress. If this had happened membership would have been restricted to trades unionists and paid officials of trade unions. The Socialists manoeuvred things so that this supposedly democratic movement had an executive committee of which seven members represented 545,316 trade unionists, while 22,861 Socialists got

five members. Further, Socialists who were trade unionists could vote in their trade unions and also in their Socialist societies, thus gaining double representation. The path to minority control was thus neatly prepared.

In 1903 Mr. Keir Hardie, leader of the I.L.P., showed how democratic Socialism was by saying on March 3: "If the old gang of trade unionists should get in on a majority on the Labour Representation Committee Party, the Independent Labour Party, which existed for the making of the Socialists, would revert to its original position." Socialist contempt for those whom they use is here again seen.

Mr. James Ramsay MacDonald became the first secretary of the Labour Representation Committee. He was never a trade unionist, but came along to the conference with the Fabian and I.L.P. bunch of Socialists.

It has been asserted that Mr. Ramsay MacDonald's election was a carefully engineered affair, framed up by the Fabian Society and the I.L.P. At any rate Mr. H. M. Hyndman, leader of the Social Democratic Federation, wrote as follows in his "Further Reminiscences" (Macmillan, 1912):

"As to Mr Ramsay MacDonald, he is not a man I care to waste much space on. I have seen a good deal of him at various times. . . Personal ambition has been his one motive throughout. . . A man who had never done a day's work as a manual labourer in his life, who was not and did not pretend to be a trade unionist, who was then working as a Liberal journalist, who had been a Scotch schoolmaster, and was at the time, I believe, also private secretary to that very earnest Radical M.P., Mr. Thomas Lough, was elected unanimously as first unpaid secretary to the newly formed political Labour Party. It seemed incredible that this should have occurred. . ."

Throughout the whole history of Socialism the student finds a widespread feeling that its propagators are all the time playing up to the masses for ulterior ends. The story is one of continual and endless intrigue and deception under cover of high-faluting talk about "Democracy", "Humanitarianism", and similar phrases.

In 1906 the Labour Representation Committee changed its name to the Labour Party, but its constitution remained the same, except that the Social Democratic Federation dropped out at an early date. The executive committee remained at twelve members, with nine appointed by the trade unions and three by the tiny Socialist bodies (two by the I.L.P. and one by the Fabian Society). "The Trades Unionists on the Committee," writes Mr. Pease in his "History of the Fabian Society", "represented in the earlier years about 100,000 members each. It then represented some 700 (Fabians)."

"The Socialist movement in this country," wrote Mr. Richard Bell, Labour M.P. and secretary of the great Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, in his little book on "Trade Unionism" in 1907, "has not grown up much on its own merits. While it was confined to Socialist organisations, its progress was very slow. . . The formation of the Labour Party, and of its compulsory maintenance fund, has been a good thing for these Socialist organisations. The bargain from their standpoint is no doubt a good one; they largely dominate the policy, whilst the Trade Unions provide the funds."

Mr. Bell pointed out that the Socialists had been getting far more than their share of the nominations for Parliamentary candidatures. The trades unionists were not Socialists but by 1907 they had been astutely manoeuvred into putting up the money to pay the salaries of seven Socialist members of Parliament and to defray their election expenses. Trade unionists who did not support these Socialists were branded as "traitors". The Socialist tail had begun well and truly to wag the trade union dog.

"The Socialists had moved very discreetly," wrote Mr. W. V. Osborne, another trade unionist in his "Sane Trade Unionism", "always covering their movements by plausible language, and progressing step by step towards a definite goal—the complete control of the Trade Union machinery for the advancement of Socialist candidatures. . . No man, not a Socialist, was allowed to act for himself in political matters, but was compelled to accept the instructions issued from headquarters. . . Since the Socialists had captured most of the official union positions, they controlled all means of communication not only as between union and union, but also as between branch and branch."

The Ideal and the Real

By 1908 Socialist penetration of the trade unions was sufficiently advanced to secure a vote committing the Labour Party was ostensibly set up because it was necessary for the trade unions "to use their political power to defend their existence"; and any thing in the way of party politics was deprecated. At the 1908 conference a Social Democratic delegate moved that the objects of the Labour Party should be:

"The overthrow of the present competitive system of capitalism and the institution of a system of public ownership and control of all the means of life."

This proposal was defeated by 951,000 votes to 91,000. Nevertheless, two days later the same conference passed a resolution differently worded but just as Socialistic, adopting as its main objective:

"The socialisation of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, to be controlled by a democratic State in the interest of the entire community."

This is the Marxian programme. It means the extinction of all private enterprise, and is necessarily destructive of all freedom. Everyone under such a system will be an employee of the State. Every man's career will depend on the opinion of him formed by his superiors. Those superiors, it is true, are to be elected by the people to act in the interests of the people.

Superficially, this SOUNDS well. Actually, what does it mean. It means that any man who opposes the rulers of a fully Socialist State opposes his employers on whose goodwill towards him his advancement in life depends. If he offends those employers he is devoid of the means of living, for everything is in the control of these officials.

In Russia after twenty years of Marxist rule the first elections were held in December 1937, and in the whole 160 millions of people under Bolshevik rule only two men came forward and contested seats against the official candidates. In 1141 constituencies there was no candidate but the nominee of the ruling officials.

A former Soviet Commissar, and now repentant Communist, Morris Gordin, Chief of the Press Bureau of the Moscow International up to 1924, in his address in Detroit in 1931 already quoted, thus described how Marxism works out in practice:

"The Communist Party is a supreme trust owning everything in Russia. . . It is the fist which represents the Soviet's ideology, brute power. . . I looked into the matter and I saw definitely that the voting of the resolutions and everything was not done by the rank and file of the party. It was the Tcheka which told the party what to do. . . To-day they suppress all free thought. They suppress not only thought, in fact they have decapitated the nation. They took the head off the Russian people; they butchered every independent intellectual; they exiled hundreds of professors, and any man who tries to think for himself in any degree is an infidel; he is a counter-revolutionist, if he does not agree with any Commissar in the Tcheka. In thinking, in writing, the military censorship tells you how to write, how to think. But, even more than that, what to write upon what subjects. This means there is no science in Russia but the science of Revolution; there is no religion but the religion of Satan, of Leninism. and this forms the basis of Proletarian Kultur. . . To-day nobody is participating in the Soviet Government except the officials of it, the select henchmen of one man, Stalin, the super-tyrant and bureaucrat, the

Emperor of the Soviet Dictatorship, the Tsar of the Proletarian Red Empire."

Democracy The Burglar's Ladder

Democracy, for Socialists, is merely a ladder by which to get control of the State: Dictatorship is what you do after you get there. The entire Socialist programme is nothing but humbug, trickery and deceit, from top to bottom. It is the concoction of aliens kicked out of their own countries, and its propagation throughout has been by methods of underhand cunning. It is essentially irreligious, and through the Great War its leading advocates played a traitor's part. Behind this movement all the time there is Money. Money was poured out like water to put over the Bolshevik revolution in Russia.

Britons, if they have regard for their own welfare, will be extremely well advised to support political doctrines more distinctly concerned with the promotion of British interests, and more British in principles and methods than ever Socialism has been, or is likely to be.



THE RED FLAG

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

Miscegenists' Manual

A *Times Educational Supplement* report recently informed readers that a multi-racial comprehensive school in Liverpool which "has been held up as a textbook example of racial integration" is to close. Originally built for 2,000 pupils, it now has only 435! The number of pupils is low "because of racial prejudice on the part of White parents." It is difficult to see how an establishment quite rightly boycotted by White parents can be considered to epitomise the multi-racial ideal. However, the capacity of negrophile liberals for double-speak has never yet ceased to amaze me and, I am sure, never will.

Street Activist

David Holmes, the former treasurer of the Liberal Party and a co-defendant with "Vaseline" Thorpe in the Scott trial, has been fined £25 at West London for importuning for an immoral purpose. Mr. Michael Howard, prosecuting, said Holmes was watched by two plainclothes police officers in the early hours of the morning as he approached three men — one in a doorway, one in a car and a third walking. As Holmes pleaded not guilty, I would be fascinated to know what he expected the police officers to believe he was really engaged in — a Liberal Party recruiting drive?

A Right 'Nana!

"Christ has been already and taken his position. When I look at a guerrilla, I see Jesus Christ" — President Canaan Banana, quoted in the *Zimbabwe Herald*.

Cuban Heels

Do-gooders at a migrant centre in Sydney, Australia, are experiencing a degree of 'culture-shock' in the form of harassment, theft and violence committed against them by a group of thirty-five rejects from Cuba. Officers from Sydney's Immigration Department who went to speak to the 'refugees' told the centre's management that the Cubans were victims of "an uncaring situation" and "probably needed mothering"! Aussies should think themselves lucky: figures issued by the U.S. Government indicate that up to half of the 40,000 Cubans who have deposited themselves in the States are homosexuals, despite an Immigration Act which forbids entry to any sexual deviants. By the time Castro has cleared out all his poofers and psychopaths, he will have left a pretty sparse population in his Socialist Paradise.

Discrete Dirt

Who should we find adding his voice to the call for the removal of offensive displays by sex shops but Mr. James Jennings, proprietor of the Amour Cinema Club in Maida Hill, which itself shows sexually-explicit films. Says Mr. J.: "It is surely not beyond the wit of the porn trade to exercise a little discretion. Surely the type of regulations affecting the front display of betting shops could be adapted to sex shops?" Oh, I see. It's perfectly alright for us all to frequent such filth so long as it's through a nice, select, tasteful door and not the grubby swing-doors of Solly's Follies. Ugh!

The Man For The Job

Peterborough's new community relations officer, according to the *Peterborough Standard*, has "impeccable credentials" for the job. While working in the North-East, he 'infiltrated the National Front to get material for his doctorate studies.' Am I to assume from this that deception is now considered an essential prerequisite for all aspirant race board personnel?

HELP BOOST CANDOUR SALES

This month, supporters taking part in our drive to expand *Candour's* readership might care to make a point of going along to meetings of the National Front, New National Front, British Movement or any other patriotic organisation in their locality to sell our journal.

For those who contemplate this as a completely new and embarrassing ordeal, let us assure you that a bit of robust sales-talk will bring you all the custom you want within a very short time. After all, you will be in friendly company!

To secure your batch of ten copies of this issue of *Candour*, simply send us £1.50 — and don't forget back-issues are available at £1.50 for *twenty*. *Candour* is your journal and it depends on your support.

CANDOUR

U.K. £3.50

Overseas airmail £4.00

U.S.A. Dollar Rate \$10.00

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bouneville), Forest House, Liss Forest and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.

53, Greencroft Towers,
Felling, Gateshead 10.